

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 367

August 4, 1995, 9:30 p.m.  
Page S-11421 Temp. Record

## DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/Academy Graduates' Term of Obligated Duty

**SUBJECT:** National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 . . . S. 1026. Thurmond motion to table the Glenn amendment No. 2123.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 52-44

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1026, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, will authorize \$264.7 billion in total budget authority for the Department of Defense, national security programs of the Department of Energy, civil defense, and military construction accounts. This amount is \$7 billion more than requested (\$5.3 billion more for procurement and \$1.7 billion more for research and development), and is \$2.6 billion less than the amount approved in the House-passed bill.

**The Glenn amendment** would strike the 1-year reduction (from 6 years to 5 years) in the term of active duty service that is required of the graduates of the three service academies. Also, it would order the Defense Department to review and report on the effects that each of various periods of obligated active duty service for graduates of the academies would have on the number and quality of the eligible and qualified applicants seeking appointment to such academies.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Thurmond moved to table the Glenn amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

The service academies have had 5 years of experience with the 6-year active duty requirement for graduates, and each has recommended that we return to a 5-year requirement. The Naval Academy reports that applications for admission have dropped by 25 percent, and that 23 percent of applicants who decline an offered appointment to the Academy do so because of the 6-year obligation. Before embarking on a career, this additional 1-year requirement is apparently a strong disincentive not to go to the Academy. However, before this 6-year policy was enacted 5 years ago 75 percent made it to the 6-year point. Some quit, and some failed to survive the probationary, "up or out" period, but most made it. In other words, after they enroll they are likely to decide to

(See other side)

YEAS (52)			NAYS (44)			NOT VOTING (4)	
Republicans (47 or 90%)	Democrats (5 or 11%)		Republicans (5 or 10%)	Democrats (39 or 89%)		Republicans (2)	Democrats (2)
Abraham	Helms	Feinstein	Bennett	Akaka	Hollings	Gregg <sup>-2</sup>	Bumpers <sup>-2</sup>
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Heflin	Campbell	Baucus	Inouye	Stevens <sup>-2</sup>	Pryor <sup>-2</sup>
Bond	Inhofe	Mikulski	Jeffords	Biden	Johnston		
Brown	Kassebaum	Moseley-Braun	Pressler	Bingaman	Kennedy		
Burns	Kempthorne	Sarbanes	Roth	Boxer	Kerrey		
Chafee	Kyl			Bradley	Kerry		
Coats	Lott			Breaux	Kohl		
Cochran	Lugar			Bryan	Lautenberg		
Cohen	Mack			Byrd	Leahy		
Coverdell	McCain			Conrad	Levin		
Craig	McConnell			Daschle	Lieberman		
D'Amato	Murkowski			Dodd	Moynihan		
DeWine	Nickles			Dorgan	Murray		
Dole	Packwood			Exon	Nunn		
Domenici	Santorum			Feingold	Pell		
Faircloth	Shelby			Ford	Reid		
Frist	Simpson			Glenn	Robb		
Gorton	Smith			Graham	Rockefeller		
Gramm	Snowe			Harkin	Simon		
Grams	Specter				Wellstone		
Grassley	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Hatfield	Thurmond						
	Warner						

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business  
2—Necessarily Absent  
3—Illness  
4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea  
AN—Announced Nay  
PY—Paired Yea  
PN—Paired Nay

make military service a career, but before they have even applied they are not as likely to want to make that commitment. The Air Force Academy has reported similar results--applications have dropped by 50 percent, and 20 percent of those who have turned down appointments have cited the 6-year requirement as the reason for declining. West Point, admittedly, has not found significant harm to come from the change to a 6-year requirement, but it still opposes it as a totally unnecessary requirement. We agree with the service academies. Our challenge is to get the best people possible to consider a military career. Once they are in, statistics show that they stay. The trick is to get them in the door. For whatever reason, the additional 1 year of service requirement that was added 5 years ago is proving to be a major disincentive to come in the door. We therefore oppose the Glenn amendment, which would keep this requirement for an additional year of service.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

Before this additional year of service requirement was added, only 75 percent of academy graduates made it to 6 years of service. Some quit. With this requirement, none may quit. We think it is very reasonable to require at least 6 years of service. After all, by the time they graduate, these students have had up to \$272,000 each invested in them by the taxpayers. They pay nothing, and in fact are given a stipend. Senators who say they think that having a 6-year service requirement is stopping qualified applicants are speculating. Admittedly, some evidence exists that some young men and women are not applying, but other evidence suggests that the quality of recruits has not gone down, but up. For instance, Academy students' average SAT scores and grades have risen. Perhaps this requirement is only weeding out those applicants who were looking for a free education, and had no interest in serving their country in the first place. Those type of applicants we can do without. Further, most studies have shown that the decline in applicants is attributable to other factors, such as the perception created by downsizing that a military career does not offer job security.

The most offensive argument, which we have heard repeatedly from alumnae of these institutions, is that the 6-year requirement makes it difficult for the academies to recruit star college athletes. If these athletes are not able to get out of the military after 5 years of service to begin lucrative football and basketball careers, they will not join. In other words, alumnae want Academy teams capable of competing in NCAA division I-AA football, and they want the taxpayers to foot the bill for star athletes that will make those teams competitive, even if those athletes have no intention of serving their country as a career.

The Glenn amendment would not close the door on lowering the requirement back to 5 years. Instead, it would require the Defense Department to study the issue and determine whether or not the 6-year requirement really is affecting the quality of recruits. This study would give us a definitive answer as to whether or not the requirement is hurting recruitment. We think we should require this study instead of acting on impulse, and we therefore support the Glenn amendment.